Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed on March 9, 2006, and are being filed concurrently with a REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed on March 9, 2006, Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 14, 16-17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brownlie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157, hereinafter Brownlie). Claims 6, 15 and 19 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,521). Claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browlie in view of TRCKA et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0039579). Claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 18 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of TRCKA and further in view of Microsoft Press (Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, ISBN:157231446XA, 1997).

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendment

Applicant does not agree with the above rejections for at least the reasons presented in the prior Responses. However, for the purpose of expediting prosecution of this application, Applicant herein presents some amendments that will further highlight the distinctions between claimed embodiments of the present invention and the cited references. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any earlier presented claims in a currently pending or continuation application, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the earlier presented claims.

The present Response amends Claims 1 and 7, cancels Claims 10-20 and adds new Claims 21-31, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-9 and 21-31. Reconsideration of the Application and of the claims is respectfully requested.

III.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed on March 9, 2006, Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 14, 16-17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brownlie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157, hereinafter Brownlie).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 now defines:

> 1.   A system for maintaining security in a distributed computing environment, comprising:
> (1) a policy manager, coupled to a network, including
>   a database for storing a security policy including a plurality of rules; and
>   a policy distributor, coupled to the database, for distributing the plurality of rules through the network;
> (2) a security engine located on a client coupled to the network, for storing a set of the plurality of rules constituting a local customized security policy received through the network from the policy distributor, and for enforcing the local customized security policy with respect to an application at the client; and
> (3) an application, coupled to the security engine;
>   wherein the security policy is updated by keeping track of a series of incremental changes to the security policy, computing an accumulated delta that reflects the series of incremental changes and sending the accumulated delta to the security engine from the policy manager such that the security engine uses the delta to update the local customized security policy.

As amended, Claim 1 defines a policy manager a security engine and an application. Furthermore, Claim 1 defines a security policy which is updated by keeping track of incremental changes to the security policy, computing an accumulated delta that reflects the incremental changes and by sending that accumulated delta to the security engine from the policy manager so that the security engine can use that delta to update the local customized security policy at the client level.

The advantages of the features defined in Claim 1 include among other things, reduced network congestion and distribution time to update a currently enforced policy. (Specification par. [0096]). For example, by pre-computing and distributing the finally accumulated changes, the invention eliminates the need to update the security policy upon every change entered by a user. Furthermore, the accumulated changes can be stored in order to subsequently reconstruct the security policy in cases of possible errors.

Brownlie teaches computer network security system and method having unilateral enforceable security policy provision. In particular, Brownlie appears to disclose a central policy management node whose authority is recognized by network nodes acts as the security policy rule distribution source (col. 3, lines 60-65).

- 8 -

In the Office Action it was proposed that:

> "Brownlie teaches a policy manager cuppled to a network, including a database for storing a security policy including a plurality of rules and a policy distributor, coupled to the database, for distributing the plurality of rules through the network, a security engine located on a client coupled to the network for storing a set of the plurality of rules constituting a local customized security policy received through the network from the policy distributor and for enforcing the local customized security policy with respect to an application at the client." (Office Action, page 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, even if the above were true, Brownlie would still fail to disclose updating the security policy by keeping track of a series of incremental changes to the security policy, calculating an accumulated delta to reflect the series of changes and sending the accumulated delta to the security engine from the policy manager such that the security engine uses the delta to update the local customized security policy, as defined in Claim 1. Brownlie does not appear to be concerned with updating the security policy in such a manner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Brownlie fails to anticipate the embodiments of Claim 1, as amended.

Furthermore, Wang and TRCKA also fail to disclose the features of Claim 1, as discussed above. In view of the these comments and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 7

Claim 7 has been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiment therein. The remarks made above in connection with Claim 1 are thus incorporated by reference herein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 7 as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5 and 8

Claims 2, 5 and 8 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 5 and 8 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them

patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

IV.   Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed March 9, 2006, Claims 6, 15 and 19 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,521). Claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browlie in view of TRCKA et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0039579). Claims 3-4, 9, 12-13 and 18 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of TRCKA and further in view of Microsoft Press (Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, ISBN:157231446XA, 1997).

Claims 3-4, 6 and 9

Claims 3-4, 6 and 9 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3-4, 6 and 9 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 10-20

Claims 10-20 have been canceled, rendering the rejections moot as to those claims. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any earlier presented claims in a currently pending or continuation application, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the earlier presented claims.

IV.   Additional Amendments

The present Response hereby adds new Claims 21-31. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 21-31 are allowable over the cited references and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

- 10 -

V.   Request for Consideration of Previously Submitted I.D.S.

Applicant has previously submitted an information disclosure statement mailed on August 27, 2003 and has not received an indication that the information therein was considered. Accordingly, the present Response re-submits the previously submitted information disclosure statement. Consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI.   Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned before an advisory action is issued in order to avoid any unnecessary filing of an appeal.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2006   By: _____

Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 11 -